



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/515,239	03/06/2000	Ju Cheon Yeo	8733.20093	7949

30827 7590 12/17/2002

MCKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K STREET, NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006

EXAMINER

KUMAR, SRILAKSHMI K

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2675

DATE MAILED: 12/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

09/515,239

Applicant(s)

YEO ET AL.

Examiner

Srilakshmi K. Kumar

Art Unit

2675

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 October 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Amendment*

The following office action is in response to Amendment A, filed October 2, 2002.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cairns et al. (GB 2,333,174 A) and in further view of Bassetti, Jr. (US 5,122,783).

As to independent claims 1 and 11, Cairns et al disclose a liquid crystal device and a method for driving a liquid crystal display device, having a demultiplexer unit (Fig. 8, item 25) connected between a data driving circuit (20) and a plurality of data lines on a liquid crystal panel, the demultiplexer unit (25) distributing color data signals (3) from any one of the output terminals of the data driving circuit to the plurality of data lines on the liquid crystal panel (Fig. 8), the method comprising, classifying color data signals to be applied to the demultiplexer unit from the data driver circuit by colors (Fig. 8, item 3);

Cairns et al do not teach consecutively providing the color data signals having a same color to the data lines by the demultiplexer unit before applying a different color. Bassetti disclose in Fig. 3A, and in col. 6, lines 47-68, where color data signals having a same color are consecutively provided to the data lines before applying a different color. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the feature of Bassetti into that of Cairns

as they both teach a method of driving liquid crystal displays. The system of Bassetti is advantageous as it reduces the number of scanning lines, thus reducing power consumption and expense.

As to claims 2 and 12, limitations of claims 1 and 10, and further comprising wherein the color data signals are applied to the data lines on the liquid crystal panel in a combination of sequences of color data signals of red, green and blue (Fig. 8, item 3 and pg 14, lines 9-12).

As to claims 3 and 13, limitations of claims 2 and 12, and further comprising wherein the color data signals are applied to the data lines on the liquid crystal panel in a sequence of red, green and blue signals (Fig. 8, item 3 and pg 14, lines 9-12).

As to claims 4, 5, 14 and 15, limitations of claims 2 and 12, and further comprising wherein the color data signals are applied to the data lines on the liquid crystal panel in a sequence of green, blue and red signals or blue, red and green, (pg. 14, lines 9-12). Cairns and Bassetti do not state this explicit sequence. Further Bassetti state the RGB arrangement of the color filter is made as indicated in Fig. 3A, but it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the RGB arrangement is not limited to that in this mode, therefore the sequence of the color data signals can be changed as it would not make much difference of the order of the sequence of the signals.

As to claims 6 and 16, limitations of claims 1 and 10, and further comprising wherein the classifying step includes arranging the color data signals according to a sequence of dot inversion system (Bassetti, Fig. 3A) where each contiguous pixel of liquid crystal panel has a reverse polarity. Although Cairns and Bassetti do not disclose where each contiguous pixel of the liquid crystal panel has a reverse polarity, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art

Art Unit: 2675

that this feature could have been present as this feature enables higher resolution and picture quality.

As to claims 7 and 17, limitations of claims 1 and 10, and further comprising wherein the demultiplexer unit includes a plurality of demultiplexers as shown in Fig. 8, item 25.

As to claims 8, 10, 18 and 20, limitations of claims 7 and 17, and further comprising wherein each of the plurality of the demultiplexers is connected to at least five or in multiple of six data lines on the liquid crystal panel. Though Cairns, in Fig. 7, shows three data lines (35) connected to the demultiplexer, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to be able to increase the data lines to five or six as this would enable higher resolution and increased picture quality in the liquid crystal display.

As to claims 9 and 19, limitations of claims 7 and 17, and further comprising wherein each of the plurality of demultiplexers is connected to an odd number of data lines as shown in Fig. 8.

### ***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed October 2, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With respect to independent claims 1 and 11, applicant argues where the prior art Bassetti does not teach where, "color data signals having a same color are consecutively provided to the data lines before applying a different color signal". Bassetti discloses where the sub-areas are energized, where the sub areas are shown in col. 6, lines 52, to be items 311, 312 and 313, which are individual colors. Thus it is shown by Bassetti that each sub area is energized.

Art Unit: 2675

***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Srilakshmi K. Kumar** whose telephone number is **(703) 306 5575**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Steven Saras, can be reached at (703) 305-9720.

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:**

**(703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)**

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Art Unit: 2675

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Srilakshmi K. Kumar  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2675

SKK  
December 15, 2002

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Steven Saras', is written over a faint, larger signature.

**STEVEN SARAS**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600**